DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 341 671 SP 033 560

AUTHOR Daniel, Larry G.; Ferrell, Charlotte M.
TITLE Clarifying Reasons Why People Aspire To Teach: An Application of Q-Methodology.
PUB DATE Nov 91
NOTE 43p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Mid-South Educational Research Association (Lexington, KY, November 14-16, 1991).
PUB TYPE Speeches/Conference Papers (150) -- Reports - Research/Technical (143)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Career Choice; Cluster Analysis; Elementary Secondary Education; Factor Analysis; *Graduate Students; Higher Education; Literature Reviews; *Occupational Aspiration; *Q Methodology; Statistical Surveys; Teacher Education Programs; *Teaching (Occupation); *Undergraduate Students

ABSTRACT

This study was conducted to test the validity of previously developed theories as to why individuals select teaching as a career and to determine whether the orientation of preservice and inservice teachers differs regarding reasons for choosing the teaching profession. A 58-item instrument, "Orientations for Teaching Survey," was designed, with item development based on the findings of previous studies. The instrument was administered to 28 undergraduate and 22 graduate students enrolled in a teacher education program, with data analyzed separately for the experienced teachers and the preservice teachers. The study used a Q-technique factor analytic method, which allows factoring across a series of test items resulting in clusters of persons relative to a given construct. Results suggest that the instrument is useful in clarifying current and potential teachers' career motivations and that Q-methodology is a useful way to develop motivational themes. Whatever the motivation for selecting teaching as a career, most individuals seem to recognize that it should not be viewed as a way to make an easy living until something better comes along. An extensive reference list, five tables, and a complete copy of the survey are appended. (Author/LL)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

teaching.mss

ED341671

CLARIFYING REASONS WHY PEOPLE ASPIRE TO TEACH: An Application of Q-Methodology

Larry G. Daniel Charlotte M. Ferrell

University of Southern Mississippi

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☐ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

L. G. Daniel

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Mid-South Educational Research Association, November 14-16, 1991, Lexington, KY.

SP033560

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

ABSTRACT

Many researchers have attempted to determine why people select teaching as a career. To date, the majority of studies have involved use of survey and interview procedures which have yielded hierarchical lists of reasons. More recently, researchers have focused on attitudinal orientations of teachers toward their profession (e.g., interpersonal, service, and material orientations) as determinants of their aspiration to teach. The present study sought to extend this recent research using Q-methodology, a small-sample factor analytic procedure which allows people to be factored across a series of test items, resulting in "clusters" of persons relative to a given construct. Twenty-two graduate and 28 undergraduate education students constituted the sample.

Findings from previous studies were used in developing a series of statements regarding reasons why people enter teaching. Subjects indicated their level of agreement with these statements. These data were analyzed separately for the graduate and undergraduate students, yielding two identifiable clusters of persons within each of these subject cohorts. Interpretation of these clusters served to substantiate assumptions about the importance of attitudinal orientations of teachers in determining career choice.

CLARIFYING REASONS WHY PEOPLE ASPIRE TO TEACH:
An Application of Q-Methodology

> Enriched family life, free time, constructive and creative work with young people, an access to self-improvement, and worthwhile associations--these are the things I expect to gain from teaching. I know of no other type of work that offers the combination of positive aspects to be found in education. I look forward to my chosen profession as a direct way to full and creative living. (Cornwell, 1947, p. 332)

For over 70 years, published research has included reports of studies attempting to determine reasons why people select teaching as a career. As the above quote illustrates, the importance of a deliberate choice based, among other things, on altruistic, service-directed motives has long been recognized. Contrariwise, it has traditionally been a common practice to frown upon those whose desire to teach is not based on a service-directed rationale, but rather on more "external influences and fortuitous circumstances" (Gould, 1934, p. 95). For example, Alcorn (1947, pp. 337-338) asserted that

> . . .the person who enters teaching primarily because of an academic interest in a subject and is satisfied with a mastery of subject matter and techniques alone will become little more than a craftsman. The best teaching is more than a craft; it is an art. . . .A love of teaching based on a love of subject matter results in a loss of perspective.

Despite the fact that such motivations for teaching are often viewed pejoratively, it has been noted with some frequency (e.g., Haubrich, 1960; Joseph & Green, 1986; Willcox & Beigel, 1953) that evaluating such motives without linking them to an individual's personality factors may yield inaccurate conclusions about the moral worth of that individual's career motivation. Furthermore, Joseph and Green (1986) suggest that the predominance of altruistic motives in determining who the "good" teachers are is waning, noting that the contemporary American social milieu precludes the necessity for teachers to justify a career choice in teaching via purely altruistic motives. In fact, recent research by Crow, Levine, and Nager (1990) spotlighting individuals in other career fields who have decided to become teachers indicates that many of these persons decide to enter teaching largely due to dissatisfaction with their original career.

Sentiment regarding the importance of determining teachers' career motivation has often been linked to teacher recruitment issues (Best; 1948; Fox, 1961; Hood, 1965; Jantzen, 1959, 1981; Roberson, Keith, & Page, 1983; Valentine, 1934), with periods of anticipated teacher shortages most notably linked to proliferation of research on career motivation. Consider, for example, that the 1950's and 1960's, years characterized by increased teacher shortages following the post World War II baby boom, were a period of much research on the topic of reasons why people teach. By contrast, such studies were virtually absent

from professional research literature during the 1970's, a decade characterized by teacher surpluses (Lutz, 1972; Montgomery, Fawcett, Sieg, & McLaughlin, 1973), Lortie's (1975) significant study notwithstanding. The 1980's, however, brought a renewed focus on predictions of teacher shortages and, in turn, a renewed interest in career motivations of teachers.

An Historical Review of Teacher Career Selection Studies

Most studies of teacher career motivation to date have involved the use of survey and/or interview procedures with convenient, although often representative, samples, resulting in hierarchically-arranged lists of reasons for teaching. A representative list of these studies along with their major findings is presented in Table 1.

Early studies during the 1920's and 1930's established the predominance of the checklist as a major methodology of collecting data regarding the career motivation of teachers. In general, these early studies suggested a blending of altruistic and practical orientations in comprising one's motivation to become a teacher. This finding is interesting considering (as previously noted) that there is a general disdain of practical considerations in shaping one's motivation to teach.

In one of the earliest published studies, Lowery (1920) set the methodological pace for a number of researchers who were to follow him. Lowery used an open-ended item to solicit students' reasons for teaching and tabulated the results across both the

total group and separately across male and female students. Results across the entire group indicated the following top five reasons for teaching: possibility for a life of service, enjoyment of the work, lifelong desire to be a teacher, general affection for children, and enjoyment of teaching over other types of work.

Newmark's (1925) study involved a single open-ended question directed to 666 students at a normal school in Philadelphia. In that study, the researcher found that interest in the profession of teaching, fondness for children, cost of career preparation, and use of normal school training as a stepping stone to college were among the most frequent reasons for students' entering normal school. Austin (1931) analyzed responses by 1105 adolescents to an essay item requiring subjects to tell what vocation they hoped to pursue and the reasons for their choice. Of the 236 subjects selecting teaching, 48 percent cited influence of a relative or teacher as the predominant reason for their choice, followed by fondness for a school subject (40 percent), fondness for teaching (26 percent), and opportunity to make a good salary (25 percent).

Lee (1928) was among the first researchers to study career motivations using a checklist of reasons. From a list of 25 reasons, Lee's 800 subjects (students at a teacher training school in New York) rank ordered the three reasons most germane to their selection of teaching as a career. Among responses frequently selected were a desire to work with children, a view

of teaching as a nice "stepping stone" occupation, desire of one's mother, opportunity for work toward a college degree, and desirability of working hours.

Reinhardt (1929) found interest in a particular subject, desire to earn money to prepare for another occupation, and fondness of children to be among the reasons most frequently selected by 408 teachers' college students from a checklist of 15 reasons for deciding to enter teaching. In a similar study, Gould (1934) had respondents (450 student teachers) select the three most significant reasons for their entering teaching from a checklist of 22 motives. Of these 22 motives, the three most frequently selected ones were interest in a particular subject, interest in children of a particular age, and opportunity to be of service to others. Similar findings have been noted in studies by Valentine (1934) and Tudhope (1944).

Jantzen (1947), in an often-cited work, developed a questionnaire of 16 reasons for entering teaching. Responses of 249 college students indicated that personal interest in children/youth, the idea of the long summer vacation, a reasonable assurance of adequate income, and a lifelong opportunity for learning topped the list of reasons for these students' selection of teaching. Interestingly, the first three of these reasons were also noted as primary reasons in Haubrich's (1960) study of 195 education students in Utah and in Hood's (1965) study of 226 students in Montana.

Orton (1948) used an open-ended question format in surveying

college students regarding their orientations for entering teaching. Written responses to his single essay item, "Why do college students want to become teachers?" were obtained from 143 education students at the University of Utah. Reasons presented by the students were categorized and tabulated, with responses related to a desire to serve others, opportunity for personal growth and development, job security, and occupational prestige most prevalent.

Using similar methodology, Willcox and Beigel (1953) presented respondents with the question "What particular happening, experience, or occasion first turned your thoughts toward teaching?" Responses from 152 college students indicated that satisfaction in working with children, example provided by a previous teacher, a lifelong desire to teach, and influence of family members were primary reasons in the students' decisions to become teachers.

Jantzen (1956) sought to determine whether orientations of persons entering teaching change significantly over time. Similar groups of male and female students were surveyed in 1946, 1948, and 1956 using Jantzen's (1947) 16-item checklist. In general, there were not a lot of changes in the factors which students of either sex selected as influencing their decisions to become teachers, with interest in children, assurance of adequate income, lifelong opportunity to learn, and availability of summer vacation remaining the four most popular choices across time. It was found, however, that of the factors recognized as important,

the tendency was for larger numbers of both men and women to indicate the importance of these factors. For example, even though "lifelong opportunity to learn" was rated consistently by female respondents as the third most important factor in selecting teaching as a career, only 51 percent of the women in 1946 felt this factor was an important reason for choosing teaching as compared to 63 percent of the women in 1956.

In a further update of these earlier studies, Jantzen (1981) compared responses of yet another sample of teachers to those of teachers sampled in previous studies. The results of this study indicated a number of noteworthy shifts in the orientations of prospective teachers between 1956 and 1979. In general, those reasons most linked to aspects of interpersonal orientation of the teacher's job (interest in dealing with children, opportunity for service to mankind, desirable personal relations) and to aspects of personal enrichment afforded by teaching (lifelong opportunity to learn, opportunity for exercising individual initiative) were selected more frequently than in previous years.

By contrast, Jantzen found that those reasons for opting to teach most related to job perquisites, job security, or obligation to be of service (assurance of income, availability of retirement benefits, opportunity to obtain tenure, opportunity for summer vacations, opportunity for advancement in the profession, ease of finding a job, use of teaching as a stepping stone occupation, obligation to society to meet demands for teacher shortages, obvious choice due to other members of the

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

family being teachers) were selected less frequently than in previous years. As to influence of others on one's career decision, the results of the 1981 study indicated a decrease in the influence of students' parents, but an increase in the influence of students' former teachers.

These findings have been corroborated by Joseph and Green (1986), who found reasons for teaching related to people, service, fondness for the school setting, and opportunity for stimulation/creativity were overwhelmingly reported as major orientations for entering teaching, as opposed to reasons centered around material benefits, time compatibility, influence of others, and psychological security, which were each reported by only one-third to one-half of the respondents. In a similar vein, Roberson, Keith, and Page (1983, p. 20) concluded:

> Job security, once reported as an important motivation for entering teaching, does not appear to be an important consideration today, except for blacks. Today's teacher aspirants are influenced by a desire to work with friendly people, and. . .are not especially concerned with "success."

These major shifts in teachers' career orientations are reflective of perceived changes in teachers based on larger changes in society and the workplace (Lortie, 1986).

In one of the few survey-type studies employing a randomly-selected sample, the American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education (1987) obtained responses from 876 education students

attending 76 different institutions in the United States. Both institutions and individual students were randomly selected. The top 10 reasons why these students have decided to enter teaching "are neither surprising or new" (p. 43), and therefore reinforce the findings of previous studies using convenient samples. These ten reasons and the percent of students who indicated them are, in descending order, "helping children grow and learn" (90%), "seems to be a challenging field" (63%), "like work conditions" (54%), "inspired by favorite teachers" (53%), "sense of vocation and honor of teaching" (52%), "could lead to other career" (44%), could be admitted and would succeed" (41%), "liked reputation of Education on campus" (22%), and "friends majoring in Education" (20%).

Variables Linked to Reasons for Selecting Teaching

Gender of Respondents

Studies of career motivations for teachers have often reported results broken down by gender of the respondents. In fact, it would appear that no other variable has received as much attention in researchers' attempts to determine why certain individuals choose to teach. Overall, the findings of the studies have failed to yield conclusive evidence of differences in the career motivations of men and women.

Newmark (1925) found that female students reported entering teaching based on "more lofty" reasons than male students, with a higher percentage of females stating reasons categorized as "wanted to teach" or "fondness for children." Using survey

methodology, Best (1948) also found differences between male and female respondents, although male respondents tended to rate certain altruistic reasons slightly higher than female respondents, whereas female respondents rated certain practical reasons slightly higher than male respondents.

By contrast, Gould (1934) found that although females report to have made their decision to teach earlier in life, there were virtually no differences found between males and females in their most frequently mentioned reasons for opting to teach. Valentine (1934) noted few difference in the orientations of men and women university students, although differences across gender were more pronounced when students were surveyed at the beginning of their university education than when the same students were surveyed at the end of their university training. Likewise, studies by Fielstra (1955), Jantzen (1959), and Joseph and Green (1986) suggest only minimal differences between males' and females' reasons for selecting teaching.

Financial Feasibility

It has often been reported that individuals select teaching because it is a relatively inexpensive career to prepare for. As early as 1925, Newmark found that approximately seven percent of respondents selected teaching as an alternative to their first choice of career due to financial considerations. Interestingly, just a decade later, Gould (1934) found that a full 25 percent of his respondents would have pursued other careers had they been financially able to do so. Hollis (1929), in an attempt to get

education students to differentiate reasons they ought to enter teaching (i.e., altruistic reasons) versus reasons they really desire to enter teaching, found that practical considerations comprised the "desire" list, with "immediate financial returns" heading the list. These findings were corroborated by Reinhardt (1929), who noted that lack of money for obtaining necessary educational training was the principal reason given by students for selecting teaching over their first-choice occupation. Interestingly, this variable seems to have been omitted from research beginning in the 1940s, possibly as a result of readily available financial aid programs for college students beginning with the GI Bill in 1944.

Teaching Level

Fox (1961) investigated the differences in the career motivations of prospective teachers based on the level of teaching (elementary versus secondary). Although there were a number of commonalities across prospective teachers of both levels, prospective elementary school teachers reported that they were influenced more highly than secondary teachers by a desire to work with children, a desire to be of service to society, and prior experiences working with children. Prospective secondary teachers were more highly motivated by their liking for a particular subject, factors related to the length of the school day and opportunity for vacations, and the opportunity to use teaching as a stepping stone occupation than were their elementary counterparts.

Age of Respondents

Joseph and Green (1986) noted differences among education students of different ages in regards to their orientations for teaching. These researchers found that the older respondents among the 234 Illinois education students included in their sample "were more inclined to emphasize the importance of intellectual and creative rewards than were younger students" (p. 30). In addition, these older students were more likely to emphasize material rewards as important in selecting a career. Younger students were more likely to downplay the importance of material benefits, focusing rather on the service aspects of the teacher's job.

A Search for Motivational Themes

A number of researchers have attempted to investigate the motives of teachers for entering the profession from a psychological point of view, with an attempt to delineate the distinct motivational or attitudinal themes common across groups of teachers relative to their reasons for becoming teachers. This line of inquiry represents a step beyond mere categorization of responses as it seeks to determine why certain factors are deemed important in career choice (Haubrich, 1960; Lefevre, 1965), or to determine which factors are most influential in the staying power of those who select a career (Murnane, 1987), or to cluster together such factors into larger conceptual categories (Lortie, 1975).

In suggesting reasons why certain employment selection

factors are important to particular teachers, Lefevre (1965) builds a number of intuitive arguments based on underlying motivational orientations. Lefevre suggested, for instance, that some may view teaching as a refuge from the adult world, that others may view teaching as a way to please significant others, that some may be exercising a desire to parent, and that yet others may teach in order to excel in the role of star "pupil." Although Lefevre's conceptualizations smack somewhat of reckless psychoanalysis, they represent a concentrated attempt at going beyond factual statements about why people teach.

As to overall motivational orientation for teaching, Lortie (1975--Chapter 2) proposed that there are at least five occupational themes that orient individuals to select teaching as a career:

(a) The interpersonal theme--a career motivation based on opportunities for "protracted contact with young people" (p. 27).

(b) The service theme--"the idea that teaching is a valuable service of special moral worth" (p. 28), i.e., that people select teaching for altruistic, other-directed reasons.

(c) The continuation theme--a career motivation based on the premise "that some who attend school become so attached to it that they are loath to leave" (p. 29). This attitude may be manifest by an affection for a hard-to-market subject or a general attachment to the school environment itself.

(d) The material benefits theme--the idea that salary and other material benefits serve as attractors to teaching. Although

teachers typically underplay the role of material rewards in the attractiveness of teaching, material benefits are regarded as important, particularly as cited by female teachers (Lortie, 1975). Moreover, Haubrich (1960) noted that many people prepare for teaching careers under the guise of the "mattress philosophy" --i.e., the security that teaching offers a livable income to fall back on if other career opportunities do not materialize.

(e) The time compatibility theme--a career motivation focused around the work schedule of the teacher. As Lortie notes, "Work days which are finished in midafternoon, numerous holidays, and long summer vacations do not go unnoticed by young people comparing teaching with alternative possibilities" (p. 32).

In addition to these original five motivational themes proposed by Lortie (1975), Joseph and Green (1986, p. 29) investigated three additional themes in their study of 234 university students in education:

> The sixth theme, <u>stimulation</u>, . . .[addressed] the need for an absorbing career and the desire for creativity [in one's job]. The seventh theme, <u>influence of others</u>, dealt with influences of parents, spouses, former teachers, and the general respect of others. The final area attempted to take into account <u>psychological</u> motivations [i.e., psychological security], such as a wish to be in authority, to have children's love, to entertain people, or to be in a field that is not competitive.

The most methodologically sophisticated study of these motivational factors to date (Roberson, Keith, & Page, 1983) utilized path analysis to study the relative impact of 17 different background and attitudinal variables on the career motivations of high school seniors who aspire to teach as compared to those who do not. The researchers surveyed an impressive sample of 58,270 students from 1,015 schools across the country. All schools utilized in the study were part of the High School and Beyond project, a national longitudinal study of school quality. Although a number of noteworthy path coefficients explaining aspiration to enter teaching were found to exist in the selected model, those most worthy of note included gender ($p = .273$), income ($p = -.256$), influence of teachers ($p = .139$), race ($p = .128$), and intellectual ability ($p = -.116$). Not suprisingly, these results suggest that women and whites will tend to be more attracted than males and minorities, that both high intellectual ability and desire for high income will tend to direct people away from teaching as a career choice, and that teachers tend to have a relatively noteworthy effect on high school students' aspirations to teach.

As previously noted, most of the research to date on teacher career motivations has utilized survey and interview procedures. Results of these studies have generally consisted of tabulated responses across the various items with little emphasis on correlational methodology or deeper underlying motivational orientations of respondents. A handful of researchers (e.g.,

Joseph and Green, 1986; Lefevre, 1965; Lortie, 1975; Roberson, et al. 1983) have attempted to develop and test theory related to these underlying motivational orientations. Furthermore, Roberson, et al. (1983) have shown the importance of utilizing correlational procedures in gaining a fuller understanding of these motivational factors affecting career choice in teaching. The present study sought to extend this recent research using Q-methodology (Stephenson, 1953), a family of small-sample factor analytic procedures which allow a research to factor people across a series of test items resulting in "person factors" or clusters of individuals who respond similarly to a given set of items.

Methodology

The purposes of the present study were (a) to test the validity of previously-developed theories as to why people select teaching as a career through the use of Q-technique factor analytic methods, and (b) to determine whether the orientations of preservice and inservice teachers differ regarding their reasons for selecting teaching as a career.

In order to achieve these purposes, a 58-item instrument titled "Orientations for Teaching Survey" was developed. The items were developed based on the findings of previous studies regarding the reasons why people enter teaching. Data were also collected on the demographic characteristics of the sample. A complete copy of the survey is provided in Appendix A. The instrument was administered during regular class sessions to 28

undergraduate and 25 graduate students enrolled in education classes at a comprehensive university in the southern United States. Since the goal of selecting these two groups was to provide an avenue for comparison of preservice versus inservice teachers, data from three of the graduate students who had not previously taught were eliminated from the analyses. No individiual identifying information was collected on the survey instruments, and respondents' confidentiality was assured.

Q-methodology generally involves placing each item separately on a 3-by-5 or similar sized card, and then having respondents sort these cards into a series of piles (usually hierarchically ranged from left to right), with descriptive headings ranging from such extremes as "strongly agree" to "strongly disagree" or "most like me" to "least like me" assigned to each pile. The researcher will then assign a value of "1" to items in the leftmost pile, a value of "2" to the items sorted into the next pile to the right, and so forth. This procedure, known as a "Q-sort," generally requires that respondents place a relatively large number of cards into the piles nearer the middle of the continuum and an increasingly small number of cards in each pile as the respondent moves toward the extremes. Hence, each respondent's ratings of the items will result in a quasi-normal distribution.

Although there are definite strengths associated with the traditional Q-sort strategy, there are also a number of weaknesses. For example, the task of sorting an exact number of

cards into the specified number of piles can become somewhat cumbersome and time-consuming, particularly if respondents are required to sort a relatively large number of items. A more serious problem has to do with the limited amount of response variance allowed by this method. By forcing respondents to place several cards in each pile, the researcher is requiring that the respondents ignore actual differences that may exist in their feelings about items within each pile. Since Q-methodology is a factor analytic technique, and since such techniques capitalize on response variance, this problem may lead to distortion of true relationships that exist among people in a given sample. Hence, Thompson (1981) has proposed two alternative methods for collecting data for Q-methodology, namely, the "mediated ranking strategy" and the "unnumbered graphic scale."

The former alternative strategy, mediated ranking, requires that the respondent complete the traditional Q-sort, and then rank order the items within the several piles. The result is a completely rank-ordered set of n items that can each be assigned a unique ranking ranging from "1" to "n." Although this method greatly increases the amount of response variance across a set of items, and may therefore produce a more highly reliable set of factors, it is not necessarily the most desirable alternative to the conventional strategy as it requires an extreme amount of deliberation on the part of the respondents after the already cumbersome task of sorting the items.

The second alternative strategy, the unnumbered graphic

scale, allows for Q-methodology data to be collected using a paper and pencil instrument. Respondents indicate their reaction to each item by drawing a vertical line at a selected point on a line between two extreme identifiers. As demonstrated by Thompson (1981) and psychometrically elaborated by Carr (1989) and Daniel (1989), this response format allows for more response variance and therefore results in more highly stable and clearly defined Q-factors.

Once Q-factors are identified, the orientation of the persons within each factor can be determined by consulting the standardized regression factor scores for each of the items. Since these factor scores are in the form of z-scores, the scores indicate the degree to which individuals within a given factor deviate from the mean response on a given item. These deviations in item responses help to differentiate the clusters of persons. Hence, for the purposes of interpreting the orientations of persons in each of the clusters toward teaching, only items with factor scores greater than |1.0| were examined.

Results

Data were analyzed separately for (a) the 22 graduate students (experienced teachers) and (b) the 28 undergraduate students (preservice teachers) included in the sample using the SPSSx FACTOR procedure and a transposed data matrix. Factors were extracted using the principal components method, and results were rotated to the varimax criterion. Two components were

extracted for each cohort based on a visual "scree" test. Person factors were determined based on a minimum factor-structure coefficient criterion of ¦.50¦. The resulting factor matrices are presented in Tables 2 and 3. Factor scores for the items across the experienced and preservice teacher clusters are presented in Tables 4 and 5, respectively.

Analysis of Factors Identified in the Experienced Teacher Cohort

All of the 22 persons in the experienced teachers cohort were correlated highly with at least one of the two person factors, and three persons had structure coefficients in excess of ¦.50¦ on both of the factors. As shown in Table 2, Factor I was most highly saturated with persons 2, 3, 4, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17, 18, 19, 20, 21, and 22. An analysis of the scores for these persons on Factor 1 indicates two item themes that identify the orientation of these persons toward teaching. First of all, this group tended to rate items associated with an altruistic and humanistic orientation toward teaching very highly. Consistent with their high ratings on this first group of items were their low ratings on items dealing with the material benefits of teaching or the ease of working in an educational setting.

The second cluster of persons identified among the experienced cohort (persons 1, 2, 3, 4, 6, 7, 18, and 21) were most distinguished by their ratings on three distinct sets of items. Higher than average ratings were assigned to items

relative to the convenience of teaching--i.e., nice working hours, suitability of the job to home life, pleasant working environment, job security. High ratings were also assigned to items dealing with self enrichment aspects of the job--opportunity for leadership and promoting respect for learning; opportunity to learn, meet people, and interact with colleagues. On the other hand, this group assigned especially low ratings to items suggesting that they selected teaching based on their own incompetence in other areas.

Interestingly, Factor II included all five of the black teachers in the experienced teacher cohort, and was primarily comprised of married persons (six of the eight persons identified). No obvious patterns across the demographic variables were noted for the people in Factor I.

Analysis of Factors Identified in the Preservice Teacher Cohort

As illustrated in Table 3, two factors of persons were recognized among those in the preservice cohort. Of the 28 persons included in this cohort, 26 were identified with at least one of the two factors using a minimum factor saliency criterion of ¦.50¦, with five persons correlating rather highly with both factors. Factor I was most highly saturated with 22 of these individuals (persons 23, 24, 25, 26, 29, 31, 32, 33, 34, 35, 36, 37, 38, 39, 41, 42, 43, 45, 46, 48, 49, and 50). Persons in this first cluster were oriented to teaching with a similar mentality as those experienced teachers identified in the first cluster

within that group. Two item themes were dominant. First there was a tendency toward giving high ratings to those items expressing altruistic, humanistic, and service motives. In addition, this group seemed to take their decision to teach very seriously, recognizing (via low ratings) that such things as salary, scholarships, or convenience of the job were not a part of their motivation to teach. Interestingly, this factor included all but one of the four black individuals included in this cohort.

The second factor among the preservice cohort included nine persons (persons 27, 28, 29, 31, 35, 40, 41, 44, and 49). All of the persons included in this factor were females who had aspirations to teach at the elementary level. This group seemed to be drawn to teaching on the basis of the material rewards and appropriateness of teaching to their individual needs. Among the items they rated most highly were those related to salary, benefits, job security, time compatibility, and desirability of the work as compared to other jobs. This group, however, had not selected teaching because they felt the work would be easy, nor did they appear to be overly egotistical and power hungry in their motives. For example among the items this group gave lowest ratings were those related to opportunity to be the center of attention, to be in authority, or to be one's own boss, or those in which teaching was perceived as easy work or an easy job to prepare for.

Discussion

The purpose of the present study was to investigate the motives of preservice and experienced teachers in their decision to enter teaching. The previous literature has suggested that studies aimed at more clearly defining motives underlying teachers' reasons for teaching are needed. The results of the present study suggest that this purpose can be achieved using continuously-scaled items and Q-methodology procedures. Four distinct clusters of individuals (person factors) were identified with these procedures.

The first person factors identified across the two cohorts were highly similar in motivation. These two clusters consisted of those individuals who valued the humanistic side of teaching, who felt a calling or a sense of missionary zeal in their approach to teaching, and who felt they could serve as an effective role model for the citizens of tomorrow. Hence, evidence of Lortie's (1975) service and interpersonal motivations tended to drive them to teach. Persons in these two groups also seemed adamant about the fact that it is not money, convenience, or ease of preparation that calls them to teaching, a mentality which serves to strengthen their level of unwavering commitment to the profession. The fact that Factor I within the preservice group included almost all the blacks in that cohort may not necessarily be noteworthy considering that so few blacks were included in the study. However the results suggest that further investigation of teaching motives across race is warranted.

Factor II within the experienced group represented well the embodiment of the "time compatibility theme" (Lortie, 1975). It is not surprising that this group was largely comprised of married persons, i.e., those more likely to have family responsibilities around which their careers would need to be shaped. However, this group seemed to also be motivated by Joseph and Green's (1986) "stimulation" theme, noting such things as the opportunities for leadership and learning and the pleasant working environment as additional motivators. This group also indicated that even though teaching offered them convenience and some intrinsic stimulation, that they by no means saw teaching as something they just fell into. Dissatisfaction with or lack of competence in previous occupations had not been motivators for this group, nor did they perceive that teaching was attracting to them simply because there is less competitiveness among teachers than among workers in other employment settings.

The final person factor (Factor II of the novice group) seems to embody the "material benefits theme" (Lortie, 1975). This group tended to be more motivated by salary, benefits, and other material rewards than were the persons in the other identified clusters. That these persons were female fits well with the notion that this motivational theme is generally more appealing to women. That this group consisted only of elementary teacher hopefuls is also interesting. It may be possible, if this group is typical of teacher education students as a whole, that there is something about teaching at the elementary level

that is more appealing to those seeking primarily extrinsic rewards. Certainly this is a matter worthy of additional study.

In sum, it would appear that the instrument derived for use in the present study is useful in pinpointing and clarifying current and potential teachers' career motivations. The present study also presents evidence that Q-methodology is a useful way to develop motivational themes necessary to understanding what it is that draws individuals into educational careers. The findings of the present study are also interesting in that they suggest that some of the oft-touted, but less than desirable, reasons for teaching (viewing teaching as easy work or as a stepping stone to another occupation) do not exist as motivators within this particular sample. By contrast, the present results suggest that whatever the motivation for selecting teaching, that most individuals seem to select teaching seriously and deliberately, recognizing that it should not simply be viewed as a way to make an easy living until something better comes along.

REFERENCES

Alcorn, M. D. (1947). Craftsman or artist? Phi Delta Kappan, 28, 336-337.

American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education. (1987). Teaching teachers: Facts & figures. Washington: AACTE.

Austin, F. M. (1931). An analysis of the motives of adolescents for the choice of the teaching profession. British Journal of Educational Psychology, 1, 87-103.

Berry, B. (1986). Why bright college students won't teach. Urban Review, 18, 269-280.

Best, J. W. (1948). Study of selected factors underlying the choice of teaching as a profession. Journal of Experimental Education, 17, 201-259.

Carr, S. C. (1989, March). Effects of different data collection strategies on Q-technique factor analytic results. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, San Francisco.

Corey, A. F. (1970). Overview of factors affecting the holding power of the teaching profession. In T. M. Stinnett (Ed.), The teacher dropout (pp. 1-11). Itasca, IL: Peacock.

Cornwell, J. D. (1947). Why I plan to teach. Phi Delta Kappan, 28, 331-332.

Crow, G. M., Levine, L., & Nager, N. (1990). No more business as usual: Career changers who became teachers. American Journal of Education, 98, 197-223.

Daniel, L. G. (1989, November). Stability of Q-factors across two data collection methods. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Mid-South Educational Research Association, Little Rock, AR. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 314 439)

Fielstra, C. (1955). An analysis of factors influencing the decision to become a teacher. Journal of Educational Research, 48, 659-667.

Fox, R. B. (1961). Factors influencing the career choice of prospective teachers. Journal of Teacher Education, 12, 427-432.

Gould, G. (1934). Motives for entering the teaching profession. Elementary School Journal, 35, 95-102.

Haubrich, V. F. (1960). The motives of prospective teachers. Journal of Teacher Education, 11, 381-386.

Hollis, E. V. (1929). Why they teach. Educational Administration and Supervision, 15, 678-684.

Hood, C. E. (1965). Why 226 university students selected teaching as a career. Clearing House, 40, 228-231.

Jantzen, J. M. (1947). Why college students choose to teach. Phi Delta Kappan, 28, 333-335.

Jantzen, J. M. (1959). An opinionaire on why college students choose to teach. Journal of Educational Research, 53, 13-17.

Jantzen, J. M. (1981). Why college students choose to teach: A longitudinal study. Journal of Teacher Education, 32(2), 45-48.

Joseph, P. B., & Green, N. (1986). Perspectives on reasons for becoming teachers. Journal of Teacher Education, 37(6), 28-33.

Kottkamp, R. B., Provenzo, E. F., & Cohn, M. M. (1986). Stability and change in a profession: Two decades of teacher attitudes, 1964-1984. Phi Delta Kappan, 67, 559-567.

Larson, K. (1966). Guide to personal advancement in the teaching profession. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

Lee, A. S. (1928). Motives of high-school graduates for entering the profession of teaching. School Review, 36, 16-24.

Lefevre, C. (1965). Why teach? Elementary School Journal, 66, 121-125.

Lortie, D. C. (1975). Schoolteacher: A sociological study. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Lortie, D. C. (1986). Teacher status in Dade County: A case of structural strain? Phi Delta Kappan, 67, 568-575.

Lowery, J. G. (1920). The attitudes of college students toward teaching. School Review, 28, 379-382.

Lutz, F. W. (1972). The 'justice effect' and teacher oversupply. Phi Delta Kappan, 53, 517-518.

McLaughlin, M. W., Pfeifer, R. S., Swanson-Owens, D., & Yee, S. (1986). Why teachers won't teach. Phi Delta Kappan, 67, 420-425.

Montgomery, J., Fawcett, L. R., Sieg, D., & McLaughlin, G. (1973). The teacher surplus: Facing the facts. Phi Delta Kappan, 54, 627.

Murnane, R. J. (1987). Understanding teacher attrition. Harvard Educational Review, 57, 177-182.

Murphy, J. T. (1987). Attracting talented students to teaching. Harvard Educational Review, 57, 182-186.

Newmark, D. (1925). An analysis of the student body of the Philadelphia Normal School. Educational Administration and Supervision, 11, 399-416.

Orton, D. A. (1948). What attracts college students to teaching? Educational Administration and Supervision, 34, 237-240.

Reinhardt, E. (1929). Probable future occupations of freshmen in a teachers' college. Elementary School Journal, 30, 200-207.

Roberson, S. D., Keith, T. Z., & Page, E. B. (1983). Now who aspires to teach? Educational Researcher, 12(6), 13-21.

Schlechty, P. C., & Vance, V. S. (1983). Recruitment, selection, and retention: The shape of the teaching force. Elementary School Journal, 83, 469-487.

Schlechty, P. C., & Vance, V. S. (1981). Do academically able teachers leave education? The North Carolina case. Phi Delta Kappan, 63, 106-112.

Stephenson, W. (1953). The study of behavior: Q-technique and its methodology. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Thompson, B. (1981, November). Factor stability as a function of item variance. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Southwest Educational Research Association, Dallas. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 205 553)

Tudhope, W. B. (1944). Motives for the choice of the teaching profession by training college students. British Journal of Educational Psychology, 14, 129-141.

Valentine, C. W. (1934). An enquiry as to reasons for the choice of the teaching profession by university students. British Journal of Educational Psychology, 4, 237-259.

Willcox, I., & Beigel, H. G. (1953). Motivations in the choice of teaching. Journal of Teacher Education, 4, 106-109.

Table 1
Motives for Teaching Reported in Various Studies[1]

Study	Survey Method[2]	n	Rankings of Motives from Selected Studies[3]									
			I	II	III	IV	V	VI	VII	VIII	IX	X
Newmark (1925)	E	666	2					4			1	
Lee (1928)	C	800	1					2,4	5	3		
Hollis (1929)	C	400	1					2,4	5	3		
Reinhardt (1929)	C	408	3			1		2,5				
Austin (1931)	E	236		4		2				1	3	
Gould (1934)	C	450	2			1			3			
Valentine (1934)	C	195 (M)				1			3		5	2
		153 (Fe)	2			1			4		5	3
Tudhope (1944)	C	216 (M)	2	1		3	5					4
		244 (Fe)	1	2,4				3				
Jantzen (1947)	C	249	1	3	2		4					
Orton (1948)	E	143		3			2		1			
Willcox & Beigel (1953)	E	152	1							2,4	3	
Fielstra (1955)	Q	230	1		5	3	2		4			
Jantzen (1959)	C	226	1	2	4		3					
Haubrich (1960)	Q	195	1	3	2							
Fox (1961)	Q	173	1			5	3		4		2	

Study	Survey Method	n	Rankings of Motives from Selected Studies I	II	III	IV	V	VI	VII	VIII	IX	X
Hood (1965)	Q	226	2					3	1			
Jantzen (Update -1981)	C	67 (M)		1	5		2			4		3
		246 (Fe)	1		5		2			4		3
Joseph & Green (1986)	Q	234			1		4		2			3
American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education[4] (1987)	Q	876	1	3	3				4			2

[1]This is not an exhaustive list of studies of this type, but serves as a representative list.

[2]E--Essay; C--Checklist; Q--Questionnaire

[3]Motives most frequently noted from the selected studies:

I. Fondness for children.
II. Adequate income/job security
III. Favorable working conditions (i.e., good hours, long vacations, desirable personal relations)
IV. Interest in a special subject
V. Lifelong opportunity to learn; desire to continue education
VI. Use of normal school training or occupation as a stepping stone
VII. Service to mankind
VIII. Influence of a relative or a teacher
IX. Interest in education
X. Opportunity for creativity; challenging career

[4]Data for this study were obtained from randomly selected subjects in 76 randomly selected AACTE institutions.

Table 2
Matrix of Q-Factors for the Experienced Teacher Cohort

	FACTOR I	FACTOR II
PERSON1	-.30224	.76648
PERSON2	.47773	.50883
PERSON3	.71673	.50226
PERSON4	.53895	.56695
PERSON5	.61487	.46534
PERSON6	.49469	.61258
PERSON7	.45182	.72539
PERSON8	.68278	.34320
PERSON9	.79825	.35143
PERSON10	.71299	.10198
PERSON11	.60167	.46495
PERSON12	.73617	.40579
PERSON13	.68375	.15514
PERSON14	.75583	.19315
PERSON15	.84171	.10159
PERSON16	.51895	.48565
PERSON17	.57957	.26397
PERSON18	.25327	.60190
PERSON19	.70161	.37065
PERSON20	.73257	.34212
PERSON21	.51718	.62475
PERSON22	.68753	.34018

Table 3
Matrix of Q-Factors for the Preservice Teacher Cohort

	FACTOR 1	FACTOR 2
PERSON23	.70094	.31478
PERSON24	.76833	.41244
PERSON25	.81888	.40350
PERSON26	.64624	.24811
PERSON27	.56232	.52036
PERSON28	.39699	.69667
PERSON29	.60925	.58329
PERSON30	.49156	.43566
PERSON31	.74590	.50993
PERSON32	.66346	.41426
PERSON33	.80785	.25203
PERSON34	.71956	.39200
PERSON35	.66581	.50990
PERSON36	.82285	.30421
PERSON37	.79377	.21704
PERSON38	.52530	.04652
PERSON39	.78101	.33067
PERSON40	.47478	.66285
PERSON41	.52330	.59661
PERSON42	.79523	.35395
PERSON43	.55255	.47860
PERSON44	-.36825	.70936
PERSON45	.63302	.31209
PERSON46	.77103	.22244
PERSON47	.43756	.45537
PERSON48	.69069	.44262
PERSON49	.64803	.61456
PERSON50	.75568	.41973

Table 4
Factors Scores for Items for Experienced Teacher Sample

ITEMS	EXPER1	EXPER2
1	1.98918*	-.52064
2	2.16898*	-.88890
3	.70456	.89319
4	-1.02268*	.15784
5	-.17741	-.19085
6	-.29562	1.51653*
7	.44905	.49163
8	1.56128*	.30879
9	.26038	.05045
10	-2.00874*	.92816
11	-.84232	-.90773
12	.95177	-.42080
13	.05494	-1.43286*
14	.97655	.12257
15	.60161	.49227
16	-.07914	-1.93928*
17	-.76129	-1.54396*
18	1.86485*	-.17713
19	.10342	-1.95398*
20	.72755	-.94898
21	-.69970	-1.53499*
22	1.38794*	-1.05171*
23	-.80243	.47043
24	.05035	-.56230
25	-.48500	-.52557
26	1.68260*	-.47484
27	.68812	.27666
28	-.16556	.11096
29	1.01066*	.18503
30	.55147	.96857
31	.85326	.75800
32	-.04082	.78957
33	.57932	.72302
34	.18095	-.34513
35	-.46995	1.24768*
36	-.28796	-.39450
37	1.22782*	.15966
38	1.03801*	.72663
39	-2.21336*	1.22203*
40	-.22940	.67220
41	.79035	1.05318*
42	-1.33568*	-.75870
43	-.90137	-1.68709*
44	-.79634	-1.86993*
45	-.21060	-.45805

(continued)

Table 4 (continued)

46	-.82772	-1.74948*
47	-.38413	-.04976
48	-1.03686*	.56649
49	-.16179	.77721
50	-1.08083*	1.53665*
51	-.57651	1.51259*
52	-1.32558*	-.67072
53	.81613	1.38787*
54	.09970	1.24554*
55	-.26918	1.69354*
56	-1.03435*	1.16427*
57	-1.94277*	-.38806
58	-.90569	-.76329

Table 5
Factors Scores for Items for Preservice Teacher Sample

	NOVICE1	NOVICE2
1	1.14664*	.93984
2	.78719	1.53211*
3	.08121	1.66906*
4	-1.24143*	1.55749*
5	-.22210	.64923
6	.02563	1.92441*
7	.78931	.98090
8	.97673	1.25933*
9	.22021	.05374
10	-.90463	-.78911
11	-.31184	-1.19462*
12	.71718	.54208
13	-.76981	-.21516
14	.62536	.17832
15	.40142	-.84012
16	-.96286	-.57939
17	-.71837	-1.61950*
18	.84873	.96157
19	-.21134	-.27518
20	.51620	.08036
21	-.34016	-1.77716*
22	1.26627*	-.23177
23	-1.36977*	1.08657*
24	-.74649	.81281
25	.29576	-1.62947*
26	1.54069*	.51951
27	1.08905*	.46016
28	-1.24823*	1.84416*
29	1.51565*	-.88672
30	1.75067*	-.68467
31	1.47837*	-.55230
32	1.20773*	-.48596
33	.86192	-.39753
34	-.03271	.16091
35	-.28715	1.54362*
36	-.71819	-.08879
37	1.29044*	.66123
38	1.31533*	-.50107
39	-.71434	-.99555
40	.68240	-1.21959*
41	1.19251*	.27598
42	-2.12559*	.53004
43	-1.12156*	-1.53722*
44	-1.98087*	.13479
45	-.53901	-.07195

(continued)

Table 5 (cont.)

46	-1.05917*	-1.11938*
47	-.57777	-.48400
48	-.43433	-1.70250*
49	-.62982	.37784
50	-1.39413*	.97348
51	.41309	-.44333
52	-1.60211*	-.12817
53	.66093	.91779
54	.38000	-.43886
55	.88646	-1.24711*
56	-.38267	1.23816*
57	-.72015	-1.76168*
58	-1.59645*	.03234

Appendix A
Items Included in the Orientations for Teaching Survey

1. I decided to enter teaching because I would like to work with young people.
2. I decided to enter teaching because teaching allows me to perform a valuable service of moral worth.
3. I decided to enter teaching because I enjoy being around the school environment.
4. I decided to enter teaching because I will have a chance to make a good salary.
5. I decided to enter teaching because teachers have nice benefits associated with their jobs.
6. I decided to enter teaching because I like the work hours and vacation time.
7. I decided to enter teaching because teaching gives me a chance to help the less fortunate.
8. I decided to enter teaching because teaching gives me an opportunity to help students gain a sense of achievement and self worth.
9. I decided to enter teaching because teaching gives me a chance to "pay back" the good teachers I have had.
10. I decided to enter teaching because my parents felt that teaching would be a good career for me.
11. I decided to enter teaching because teaching gives me an opportunity to be in authority.
12. I decided to enter teaching because teaching allows me to experience the love and respect of children.
13. I decided to enter teaching because teaching is a relatively non-competitive occupation.
14. I decided to enter teaching because teaching is an intellectually stimulating occupation.
15. I decided to enter teaching because I have an affection for a particular subject matter.
16. I decided to enter teaching because I was dissatisfied with work I had done in other fields.
17. I decided to enter teaching because it is less expensive to prepare to teach than to prepare for many other fields.
18. I decided to enter teaching because teaching is a fulfilling and challenging occupation.
19. I decided to enter teaching because I am more comfortable with children than with adults.
20. I decided to enter teaching because I would like to solve some of the problems in the educational system.
21. I decided to enter teaching because I like the thought of being the center of attention in a room of people.
22. I decided to enter teaching because good teachers are needed so badly.
23. I decided to enter teaching because teaching was the best job among those jobs most readily available to me.
24. I decided to enter teaching because teaching is a prestigious occupation.
25. I decided to enter teaching because teaching gives me a chance to be my own boss.
26. I decided to enter teaching because I love children.
27. I decided to enter teaching because I have enjoyed working with children in other contexts, and felt teaching would be just as enjoyable.
28. I decided to enter teaching because teaching was the best job among those I am most suited for.

29. I decided to enter teaching because I feel a personal "calling" to teach.
30. I decided to enter teaching because I have a desire to impart knowledge to other people.
31. I decided to enter teaching because teaching gives me a chance to make an impact on society.
32. I decided to enter teaching because I have always wanted to teach.
33. I decided to enter teaching because teaching is a creative profession.
34. I decided to enter teaching because as a teacher I can have opportunities to work with extracurricular activities I enjoy.
35. I decided to enter teaching because the time schedule will be compatible with my home situation.
36. I decided to enter teaching because teaching gives me a chance to improve my social standing.
37. I decided to enter teaching because teaching gives me a chance to serve as a positive role model for children.
38. I decided to enter teaching because teaching fits well with my personality.
39. I decided to enter teaching because teaching is a tradition in my family.
40. I decided to enter teaching because people often regard me as a natural teacher.
41. I decided to enter teaching because teaching gives me the opportunity to promote respect for knowledge and learning.
42. I decided to enter teaching because some of my friends majored in education.
43. I decided to enter teaching because I trained for another field, but could not get a job.
44. I decided to enter teaching because I trained for another field, but did not feel competent in that field.
45. I decided to enter teaching because someone I highly respected told me I would be a good teacher.
46. I decided to enter teaching because I was told about a scholarship or tuition reimbursement program available to persons entering teacher education programs.
47. I decided to enter teaching because teaching offers me a good opportunity for career advancement.
48. I decided to enter teaching because teaching can easily lead me to other careers.
49. I decided to enter teaching because teaching can help me develop character.
50. I decided to enter teaching because teachers have a pleasant working environment.
51. I decided to enter teaching because teaching gives me opportunities for leadership.
52. I decided to enter teaching because teaching is an easy job to train for.
53. I decided to enter teaching because teaching gives me a lifelong opportunity to learn.
54. I decided to enter teaching because teaching gives me an opportunity to interact with interesting colleagues.
55. I decided to enter teaching because teaching gives me an opportunity to meet a lot of people.
56. I decided to enter teaching because teaching offers me a job with security.
57. I decided to enter teaching because teaching is a very easy job.
58. I decided to enter teaching because I heard a motivating speech about teaching or was influenced by media material focused on the benefits of teaching.